

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 31, 2007. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination, of which Claim 1 is in independent form. Claims 1-19 have been amended to define Applicants' invention more clearly. Claim 20 has been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants note that at page 3, point 11, of the Office Action it states that with reference to Claim 15, the limitation "technology resource" constitutes a lack of antecedent basis. Since Claim 15 does not contain such a limitation, Applicants presume that the rejection at page 3, point 11, was intended for Claim 14.

Applicants have carefully reviewed and amended Claims 11-14 and 17, as deemed necessary, to ensure that they conform fully to the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, with special attention to the points raised in points 3-11 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 112, second paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 10 and 12 were provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, as being unpatentable over Claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent Appln. No. 10/628,731, of which the present application is a descendant. Applicants note that the claims of that co-pending application have not yet been allowed, and thus no further response to this rejection is required at present.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,910,987 (*Ginter*).

Applicants submit that independent Claim 1, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a method for facilitating the allocation of technology resource billings incurred by a user. Important features of Claim 1 are “receiving data corresponding to usage of a technology resource by said user”, “receiving user information including an internal structure defining a group within an entity, and billing information for said group” and “allocating said technology resource billings to at least one of said user and said group, based on said user information.” By virtue of these features, the technology resource billing data is sorted according to the particular internal organization of the entity. This enables the organization to monitor, identify, allocate and distribute the costs incurred by a designated account, project, division or third party relating to its respective consumption of raw technology resources.

Ginter, as understood by Applicants, relates to systems and methods for secure transaction management and electronic rights protection. In *Ginter*, virtual distribution environments (VDEs) help to ensure that information is accessed and used only in authorized ways, and maintain the integrity, availability and/or confidentiality of the information. The VDEs secure, administer and audit electronic information use.

Nothing has been found in *Ginter* that is believed to teach or suggest the “receiving,” “receiving” and “allocating” features recited in Claim 1 to sort the

technology resource billing data according to the particular internal organization of the entity. At best, *Ginter* provides for monitoring of access to electronic information for billing purposes. This is in stark contrast to the method of Claim 1 for facilitating the allocation of technology resource billings including, among others, receiving technology resource billing data, receiving user information including the internal structure of an entity, and allocating said technology resource billings based on said user information. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Ginter*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

The other rejected claims in this application depend from the independent claim discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and an early allowance of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1973380_1